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**Relations**

The British Women Writers Conference will engage the theme of “Relations” for its 23rd annual meeting to be held in New York City. The inspiration for this theme comes from Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, who taught at the Graduate Center from 1998-2009, and whose investment in relations continues to reverberate both within our department and in the field at large. One of her last courses, “Reading Relations,” explored literary constructions and alternative understandings of relationality [link to the syllabus forthcoming]. In this spirit, we invite papers—as well as panel proposals—that focus on possible interpretations of and approaches to relationality, broadly conceived. We welcome investigations of interaction, exchange, correlation, or conjunction. Alternately, treatments might focus on relationality as a political, historical, global, social, personal, critical or textual phenomenon.

For paper proposals, please send a 300-word abstract and a short bio (in a single attachment) to [bwwc2015@gmail.com](mailto:bwwc2015@gmail.com) by January 15th, 2015. For full panel proposals, please compile all proposals, along with a brief rationale for the panel, into a single document. Papers and panels must address the theme and its application to British women’s literature of the long 18th- or 19th-centuries.

**Possible topics may include, but are not limited to:**

***Conceptual Relations:***  
Influence (literary or otherwise)  
Subject-Object relations  
Human-Animal relations  
Human-Machine relations  
Darwinian relations  
Affect  
Connection  
Complementarity  
Synthesis  
Affiliation  
Collaboration  
Spatial arrangements/Bodies in space  
Communication

***Critical/Textual Relations:***  
Theoretical approaches  
Hermeneutic relations  
Reader relations  
Biographical relationships  
Literary circles/networks  
Relations between literary forms/genres/traditions/conventions  
Palimpsests  
Pedagogical Relations:  
Pedagogical approaches  
Text-Media relations  
Interdisciplinarity  
Adaptations

***Personal Relations:***  
Sexual relations/Intimate relations  
Interiority  
Domestic arrangements  
Care-giving, professional and personal  
Courtship/Marriage/Divorce  
Familial Relationships/Kinship  
Friendship

***Global Relations:***  
Cosmopolitanism  
Economic systems  
Trade  
Exploration  
Anthropological interactions  
Social/Political Relations:  
Social arrangements  
Class relations  
Labor relations  
Gender relations  
Community  
Political relationships  
Revolutionary relations  
Colonial relations  
Race relations  
Cross-national/cross-cultural relations  
Historical connections

**Abstract: Corinne, Fanny & Mary: Objects of Pity Or…?**

Madame de Stael established herself as a major writer in the 19th century after the publication of *Corinne, or Italy (1807),* her most critically-acclaimed novel. For literary figures like Emily Dickinson, George Eliot and Jane Austen, de Stael was an influential female powerhouse; for others, like Mary Wollstonecraft, although equally influenced, raucously disagreed with the opinion of Corinne as an “inspirational” figure. Many critics focus on Wollstonecraft’s 1792 novel, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, in discussion of de Stael and her Corinne as “objects of pity.”

I would like to expand off of this comparison, not as binary, but as justification for de Stael’s conceptualization of Corinne, and Jane Austen’s creation of Fanny Price and Mary Crawford in *Mansfield Park (1814)*. I will primarily use *Corinne, or Italy* and *Mansfield Park*, as well as “Chapter V: Animadversions on Some of the Writers Who Have Rendered Women Objects of Pity, Bordering on Contempt” of Wollstonecraft’s to argue that de Stael and Austen used the “object” in both a figurative and literal sense to suggest their own definition of their primary “subject,” the literary female. While the two authors have never been seen as compatriots, I believe their novels work in tandem to mutually counter and represent Wollstonecraft’s feministic viewpoints, and the way the female thrives in a domesticated, patriarchal society.

In the discovery of the subject and object relationship, the literal objects Corinne and Fanny are attached to (art, books, letters, jewelry) as well as the objects they are seen to represent (Corinne and the mechanical doll, Fanny as an object to be acquired) are deliberately placed to answer Wollstonecraft’s question of the “passive indolent wom[a]n” and how they “perform their part” (34).